

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are in response to the Advisory Action of Examiner Pierre Miche Bataille, dated 21 Jan 2004. The Final Action is dated 27 Oct 2003.

Claims 1 and 31-49 are in the case, none having been allowed.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 31-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Steely, Jr., et al. U.S. Patent 6,249,520 (hereinafter, Steely or Steely, Jr.).

Steely US Patent 6,249,520 B1 issued Jun. 19, 2001 on application S/N 08/957,664 filed Oct. 24, 1997.

Applicants application is a divisional of, and claims priority of, U.S. Patent Application S/N 08/890,341 filed 10 Jul 1997, which is before the effective priority date of Steely.

Consequently, applicants request that the rejection of claims 1 and 31-39 over Seely be withdrawn and these claims allowed.

Applicants have submitted new claims 40-49, representing and corresponding respectively to claims 1 and 31-39 as previously or originally presented. These claims (1 and 31-39 as previously or originally presented) had also been rejected under Steely. However, these claims are also entitled to the priority date of 10 Jul 1997, well before the Steely effective date of 24 Oct 1997.

Applicants, therefore, request that claims 40-49 also be allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Applicant urges that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1, and 31-49.

Applicants believe that the case is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner concludes otherwise, applicant's attorney requests that the Examiner contact him at the number set forth below to determine how the case can be put in condition for allowance without further prosecution.

Sincerely,

Howard T. Olnowich

By


Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 27 Jan 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Fax: (607) 687-7848